



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NICANOR GATE AND THE BRASS GATE¹.

(a) *The Statements of the Mishna.*

THERE are two opposed opinions as to the position of the brass gate. Many agree with the statements in the Talmudic literature and designate it as the eastern entrance into the fore-court of laymen, whilst others, as Grätz², Spiess³, and Schürer⁴ place it on the east side of the fore-court of women. The basis for this difference of opinion is, on the one hand, the Mishna, *Middloth*, I, 4, and II, 6, and, on the other, Josephus, *Bellum*, V, 5, 3. It will therefore serve our purpose best if we reserve our consideration of these two passages, and choose a third one, in order to examine its evidence along with the other descriptions. In *Tamid*, I, 3, at the beginning of the description of the sacrificial service for the morning, the following is related: "The priest, whose function it is to take the ashes from the altar, goes from the chamber Beth Hammôked—in which the officiating priests pass the night—by a small door, which he opens with a key, into the Azarah, and the other priests follow him hither with two torches. Here they separate into two groups with one torch each; the one goes by the Exedra towards the east, the other by the Exedra towards the west. On their way they search until they reach the place where the baked food offerings are prepared. On meeting they report to each other that everything is right, and they then let those

¹ Compare *J. Q. R.*, IX, p. 678 sq.

² *Monatsschrift*, 1876, p. 434.

³ *Das Jerusalem des Josephus*, p. 76.

⁴ *Geschichte*, II, p. 229.

who have to prepare the baked food offerings perform their functions." It is clear from this account that the priests, on their round, did not leave the Azarah, the space enclosed by the surrounding wall; for without deviating they went along this wall. The gates of the surrounding wall and all doors, except the one by which the priests entered from their chamber into the Azarah, were still closed; neither of the two groups can therefore have entered another space by a gate. Now we know that the one group went towards the east from the chamber which was situated on the northern side of the surrounding wall (*Middoth*, I, 5); the other moved in the opposite direction and, soon reaching the north-west corner of the wall, went along the western wall in order to take from the west-southern corner on the southern side the direction towards the east, and thus to meet the first group on the east side of the Azarah. Where they met together in the east is designated by the Mishna as the place where the baked food offerings were prepared. In *Middoth*, I, 4, it is stated: "On the east side of the Azarah was the Nicanor gate, which had two chambers, one to the right, the other to the left; the one was the chamber of Pinehas, who looked after the priestly vestments, the other for those who prepared the baked food offerings." From the passage which we have dealt with before we have learned that the last-named chamber was situated in the east of the Azarah, which the priests reached without having to pass through any gate; here we are informed that this very chamber was situated at the side of the Nicanor gate; this gate must therefore have been on the eastern side of the Azarah and have led into the Azarah¹. This, however, is expressly and unmistakably stated in the Mishna,

¹ It is also evident from the name and the designation of the two chambers which are here mentioned, that we are not within the fore-court of women. For the Mishna, *Middoth*, II, 5, states first, that the four chambers of the fore-court of women were in its four corners; and secondly, it gives their names and designation, which are quite different. If the two chambers do not belong to the fore-court of women then the gate too, whose sides were occupied by them, cannot have been situated in it.

Middoth, I, 4: ושלושה בצפון, שלושה בעזרה, ושלושה בדרום, ואחר במזרח. שבדרום שער הדלק, שני לו שער הבכורות, שלישי לו שער המים. שבמזרחי שער נקנור: Here, only the gates of the Azarah are spoken of, no mention is made of the fore-court of women, and as the eastern gate the Nicanor gate is given. Apart from the fact that עזרה, without any further definition, only designates the space within the surrounding wall, not including the fore-court of women, which was situated without, the Mishna cannot possibly have made a reference to this fore-court, as it only enumerates seven gates¹, and in the whole chapter no mention is made of the fore-court of women².

We come to the same conclusion if we consider a series of ancient remarks which we find in Talmudical writings; their evidence is the more valuable since the information which they give us about the question, with which we are dealing, is but casual and unintentional, while their contents mainly deal with quite a different subject. In Lev. xiv. 11 the injunction is given that the priests should place the man, who, having been cured of leprosy and being clean, brings his offering in order to be declared entirely clean, with the victim before the Lord in the entrance of the tent of meeting, פתח אהל מועד, לפני " In later times it had to be decided which place in the temple of Jerusalem corresponded to the letter of the precept. Let us suppose that there was no tradition on that point, and that we had to determine the place on the basis of the Biblical injunction. We would first of all be induced by לפני " to infer that the offerer might proceed so far into the sanctuary as the law admitted the layman, viz. not only into the entrance of the fore-court of laymen, but close to the altar. This is also suggested by פתח אהל מועד, for according to Exod. xl. 6, 29 the altar was at the entrance

¹ Correspondingly there are mentioned in Tos. *Shekalim*, II, 15, only seven keys of the Azarah, and in *Shekalim*, V, 2, only seven Amarkhols; see *Tamid*, 27 a.

² See *J. Q. R.*, X, 706 sq.

of the tent of meeting. This is further confirmed by the following consideration. In the same chapter, Lev. xiv. 11-18, the priest is directed to take of the blood of the victim killed in the immediate proximity of the altar, and put it upon the tip of the ear and upon the great toe of him that brings the offering; hence the latter must stand close by. We cannot suppose that he stood in the fore-court of women¹, for in that case the priest would have had to descend with the blood the fifteen steps from the fore-court of laymen into the fore-court of women, in order to sprinkle it upon the ear and foot; then he would have had to re-ascend, and to go down again to perform the rite in regard to the oil. Apart from this the blood might meanwhile stiffen², and it was not lawful to take it out of the fore-

¹ I will here take no account of the fact that if "לפני" would here signify the fore-court of women we should have to presume, as a consequence, that, in other cases too, the offerer would have to perform the function, committed to him, viz. the putting of his hand on the offering, in the same fore-court. For in Lev. i. 3 in regard to the oblation of a burnt offering, in i. 3 and vii. 12 of a peace offering, in iv. 4 of a sin offering of the high-priest, and iv. 15 of a sin offering of the congregation, "לפני" is also designated as the place where the hand should be laid on the offering. But an account of what actually took place in the temple shows that this was done in the Azarah. For in *Hagigah*, 16 b, *Sifra*, p. 4 c, the following communication which Abba Eleasar made to R. Jose ben Halafta, is given: "Once we had a peace offering and we led it into the fore-court of women; the women laid their hands upon it, not because they were ordered to do it, but we permitted it in order to please them." Otherwise the victim would not have been brought into the fore-court of women, but into the fore-court of laymen. According to an account in *Beza*, 20 a (*Tos. Hagigah*, II, 11, 12; *j. Hagigah*, II, 78 a), Hillel also laid the hand on the offering in the Azarah. The casting of lots upon the two goats on the day of atonement would otherwise, according to Lev. xvi. 7, have had to take place in the fore-court of women, but it was actually done in the fore-court of laymen, according to *Joma*, III, 9. From all these passages it is clear that both "לפני" and "פניו" signify the inner fore-court. This is confirmed by *Sifre Numeri*, § 35 a, *Nazir*, 45 a, in the remark about "פניו" in Num. vi. 18; for we read there that the Nazirite should by rights have his hair cut in the sanctuary; see *Rashi* on Num. vi. 18 and *Nazir*, 45 a.

² See *Pessah*. V, 5, and *Joma*, 61 b.

court¹. All these considerations would lead us to suppose that the offerer came into the proximity of the altar, just as with other offerings². The same may be said about the precept contained in Num. v. 18 in regard to the woman suspected of adultery, "והעמיד הכהן את האשה לפני"; here too the priest has to set her "before the Lord," and put the offering of memorial in her hands; then to wave it "before the Lord," bring it unto the altar, burn part of it upon the altar, and immediately afterwards make her drink the bitter water. Here too he would have to descend and ascend twice, if the woman stood in the fore-court of women; and this, though easier than in the former case, is not less improbable³. The same would be the case in regard to the atonement which the priest had to make for a woman having given birth to a child, according to Lev. xii. 7, and for one having become clean according to Lev. xv. 29, 30. Now we learn from *Sifra* (p. 69 d) on the precept about the offerings of those who have been cured of leprosy: אהוריהם נקנור, למזרח ופניהם, למערב, from *Sifre* (*Numeri*, § 9) on the woman suspected of adultery: לפני "בשער נקנור", and from the Mishna, *Sota*, I, 5, on these two and the lying-in woman: מעלין אותה לשער המזרח לשער נקנור ששם משקין את הסוטות ומטהרין את היולדות ומטהרין את המצורעים; that these persons were placed in the Nicanor gate in the east. They were not admitted to the inner fore-court because of the precept: עזרת ישראל מקודשת ממה: עזרת ישראל כפורים נכנס לשם; he who had not obtained the

¹ See Rashi in *Pessah*. 85 b.

² See the Baraita in *Joma*, 36 a; *Tos. Menahoth*, X, 12, 16; *Mishna, Menah.* IX, 5.

³ See also Philo, *De specialibus legibus*, III, 10 (Mangey, II, 309): καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ στὰς ἀντικρὺ τοῦ βωμοῦ, παρόντος τοῦ κατ' ἐκείνην τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἱερωμένου; he does, indeed, only refer to the man, but still with him "לפני" means the altar. In *Antiquit.*, III, 11, 6, in discoursing on the Biblical regulation, Josephus says: τῇ δὲ γυναῖκα στήσας τις τῶν ἱερέων κατὰ τὰς πύλας, αἱ δ' εἰσὶ τετραμμένοι πρὸς τὸν νεών, and refers the conditions of his time to the Bible. He certainly does not mean the eastern gate of the fore-court of women.

atonement by the sacrifice offered after Levitical uncleanness was not allowed to enter the fore-court of laymen. It is, however, clear from the above considerations that they were not sent to the fore-court of women, but to the entrance of the fore-court which they were forbidden to enter; hence, the Nicanor gate, which is mentioned in these passages, can only have been situated in the east of the fore-court of laymen. This is confirmed by the remark in *Tos. Kelim*, I, I, 10, that all those who were unclean according to Levitical laws committed a sin in passing the Nicanor gate, even if they only required the atonement by the sacrifice to complete their ritual purity.

We also know the exterior condition of the Nicanor gate, which led into the fore-court of laymen, from the Mishna. For it is stated in *Middoth*, II, 3, that all the gates of the sanctuary, with the exception of the Nicanor gate, were transformed into golden ones; the latter retained its beautiful brass coating. Rabbi Elieser ben Jacob, who still knew the temple, relates in *Joma*, 38 b (*Tos. Joma*, II, 4; *j. Joma*, III, 41 a): נחשת קלוניתא היתה והיתה מאירה בשל: זזה, that it was of Corinthian brass, and that it glittered like gold. In this we have something to go by in our inquiry whether the statements of Josephus, who does not name the gates of the temple, but only describes them according to their position and quality, about the eastern gate of the surrounding wall of the temple, agree with the accounts of the Mishna, which we have dealt with already. But, before we do this, I have to call attention to another point in the text of the last-mentioned Mishna about the Nicanor gate. For the Mishna in *Middoth*, II, 3, says: הין משער נקנור מפני שנעשה בהם נס ויש—אומרים מפני שנחושטן מצהיב; here the suffix of the plural form in בהם and שנחושטן must strike us at once, for both refer to שער נקנור, which is in the singular form. We cannot regard this in two cases to be either chance or an error, but suppose that originally שערי was given. And as a matter of fact the Mishna in *Joma*, 38 a, *j. Joma*, III, 41 a, and

Tos. *Joma*, II, 4, is given in this form. This is not a single and exceptional passage; for the text in *Sifre* (*Numeri*, § 9) is: לפני יי בשערי נקנור • מכאן אמרו ראש המעמד; here the gate is mentioned twice in the plural form and likewise in the Mishna, *Negaim*, XIV, 9: כל הנכנס בשערי נקנור; and Tos. *Negaim*, VIII, 9: כל הנכנס בשערי נקנור; לעזרה דרך שערי נקנור; Tos. *Kelim*, I, I, 12: שער נקנור מחנה לויה • משערי נקנור ולפנים מחנה שכינה לפיכך כהן מעמידה על: שער נקנור ומראה קלונה לכל שער נקנור, but the Babylonian Talmud still knows the plural form (*Nazir*, 45 a)³, as is clearly shown for instance in the sentence: מכרי שערי נקנור היכא קיימין; hence there cannot be any doubt that this is the original form. To this has to be added another certain proof, viz. that the corresponding appellation of the gate after its position alone, viz. שער המזרח, is also used in the plural form. This confirms at the same time its identity with the Nicanor gate⁴. For there is a Baraitha in *Rosh hash.* 27 a: וכשבא דבר אצל חכמים אמרו: לא היו נוהגין כן אלא בשערי מזרח ובהר הבית בלבד; in the Mishna, *Taanith*, II, 5 (Tos. *Taanith*, I, 14), whose text otherwise agrees, we have indeed בשער in the singular form, but the Cambridge edition of the Mishna by Lowe, as well as the

¹ This quotation does not quite agree with the text of our Mishna, *Tamid*, V, 6, where בשער המזרח is given. The Midrash, *Numeri Rab.* 9, 200 d, has also the text of *Sifre*, but בשער in the singular. See *Sifra*, p. 69 d.

² It is true that before and after שער is also given in the singular form.

³ In *Pessah.* 85 b, too, all MSS. quoted by Rabbinowicz, Commentaries and old editions, have נקנור שער נקנור. See Tos. *Nazir*, VI, 1.

⁴ But שער המזרח in *Orla*, II, 12: ושער המזרח היה מזרחי—cannot with certainty be recognized as the eastern gate of the inner fore-court. We meet Rabban Gamaliel, who is mentioned here, still sitting on the stair of the temple mount (*Sabbat*, 115 a; Tos. *Sabbat*, XIII, 3, and *Synhedrin*, 11 b; *j. Synhedrin*, I, 18 d; Tos. *Synhedrin*, II, 6); see also *Aboda Zara*, 20 a; *j. Aboda Zara*, I, 40 a, below. Equally uncertain appears to me the meaning in *Berakh.* IX, 5: לא יקל אדם את ראשו כנגד שער המזרח שהוא מכוון כנגד בית קרש הקדשים; although the eastern gate of the inner fore-court and not that of the wall of the temple mount is probably meant; see Rashi on *Berakh.* 54 a.

whole large series of evidence which Rabbinowicz furnishes to *Taanith*, 15 b, have here the plural form too. The Mishna, *Joma*, I, 3, has the same: ערב יום הכפורים שחרית מעמידין אותו בשערי המזרח ומעבירין לפניו פרים וכבשים כרי שיהא מכיר ורגיל בעבודה, and among others *J. Joma*, I, 39 a, has there also the plural¹.

And now the question arises, what is meant by this plural, as there is no doubt that only the Nicanor gate is spoken of? From the account in *Joma*, III, 3: נקטר נעשו נסים לרלחותיו, which corresponds with *Middoth*, II, 3, we might suppose that שערי refers to the two folds of the gate. But folding doors were not only in the eastern gate, but in all the gates, as Josephus (*Bellum*, V, 5, 3) and the Mishna (*Middoth*, II, 3) tell us. I therefore think it more probable that the designation of the eastern gate in the plural form refers to the small doors which were only in that one of all the seven gates of the fore-court (*Shekalim*, VI, 3; *Middoth*, II, 6): ושני פשפשין היו לו אחר בימינו ואחר: בשמאלו². It seems as if all sacrificial functions which were performed in the eastern gate were carried out, not in the large gate, but in the two side doors. For the following fact is very remarkable. As far as I can see I find nowhere in any of the statements about the sanctuary which have come down to us, that a visitor of the temple entered the inner fore-court, where he should be present at his offering or the public sacrifice, by the eastern gate. But all took the way through the six gates in the south and north or, as it appears, through the northern gates only, as the sacrificial service was done to a great extent on this side, and the chamber which served its purpose was also there (*Middoth*, I, 5, 6; V, 3); they left the fore-court

¹ See also Rashi on *Sota*, 20 a, upon the Mishna, *Sebahim*, 32 b, and Tossafoth in *Jebamoth*, 7 b, s. v. זה נקט, and Rabbinowicz in *Sebah*, 32 b, *Pessah*, 85 b: Rashi and Tossafoth in *Pessah*, 82 a.

² These two side doors are also mentioned by Rabbi Johanan in the *Pesikta di R. Kahana*, p. 136 b, *Pesikta Rab.* 32, 149 a: שער מזרחי של בית המקדש; comp. Bacher, *Agada der paläst. Amoräer*, I, p. 335, note 4, and *Yalkut Makhiri*, p. 201.

again by the southern gates. This fact is expressly stated of the priests in *Sukka*, V, 8: *הנכנסין חולקין בצפון והיוצאין בדרום*, that those entering upon the service assemble in the north to receive their portions of the shew bread, while those who leave do so in the south. And more clearly still the Baraitha in *Sukka*, 56 b (Tos. *Sukka*, IV, 25), adds: *הנכנסין חולקין בצפון כדי שיראו שהן נכנסין והיוצאים חולקים בדרום כדי שיראו שהן יוצאין*. And of the laymen who ascended into the temple the Mishna (*Middoth*, II, 2) also relates: *כל הנכנסין לחר הבית דרך ימין ומקיפין ויוצאין דרך שמאל*—that all who come up to the temple mount go to the right, and leave it on the left side, which means the north and south¹; for the temple was situated from east to west. This fact is already stated in Ezek. xlv. 9: "When the people of the land appear before the Lord on the festivals, he who has entered by the northern gate to make a reverence should go out by the southern gate; and he who enters by the southern gate should go out by the northern gate; he should not return by the gate by which he has entered, but should leave on the opposite side." It is not even supposed here that the eastern gate too may have been used as an entrance or exit. And thus it was in the temple of Herod. Those who had been cured of leprosy or issue of blood, and the lying-in women after the period of their purification had elapsed, brought their offerings on that side of the fore-court, and they entered by the two small side doors, as no deviation was made from the custom not to use the eastern gate as an entrance for those who brought offerings. And the same was the case with the gate of the temple house; Ezek. in xlv. 1, 2, expressly states that it had to remain closed. In the temple of Herod, however, the entry by

¹ The Talmud editions have *לשערי מרחו של פתח שער נקטר*, and likewise the Mishna. But Rashi gives in *Nazir*, 45 a, above, the original words as we have given them in the text. And we also find the same sentence in the Mishna of the Talmud of Jerusalem; likewise the Tosifta, *Sota*, I, 4, gives *לשערי מרחו ולשער נקטר*. If we understand by the gates, in the plural form, the small doors of the Nicanor gate, then the text of the Babylonian Talmud can be explained without difficulty.

that gate had become necessary because of the arrangement of the sacrificial service, and in order not to contravene the long-established custom, two small side doors were made here by which the priests entered (*Middoth*, IV, 2). There is another passage deserving our notice, for it seems to contradict this suggestion about these two small side entrances of the Nicanor gate. For we find in the Mishna, *Sota*, I, 5¹: לשערי מזרח אותה לשערי מרחשם משקין את הסוֹטוֹת ומטהרין את היולדות ומטהרין את המצורעין that the woman suspected of adultery, in case she denied her guilt, was conducted into the eastern gates into the Nicanor gates. We get the impression as if two different gates are here spoken of, the one of which is more clearly defined by the other. But they mean in fact one and the same thing, and the second word stands in apposition to the first to define it more clearly.

(b) *The Statements of Josephus on the Brass Gate.*

In *Bellum*, V, 5, 3, Josephus says: "Nine of the gates were entirely plated with gold and silver, and their posts and upper thresholds; only one—ἡ ξξωθεν τοῦ νεῶς—was of Corinthian brass, and was far superior in value to those covered with gold and silver." The meaning of the word νεῶς = ναός, which is used here, is quite clear from the detailed description in *Bellum*, V, 5, 4; it refers to the temple house, which was in the middle of the space enclosed by the surrounding wall, and which had a large open door on the east side. There was on the outside of the temple house in the east the gate which led into the fore-court of laymen, and which is given by the Mishna as the Nicanor gate. We can certainly not suppose that Josephus may have considered the eastern gate of the fore-court of women, which was even separated from the eastern gate of the fore-court of laymen by fifteen steps and the

¹ See above, p. 54.

whole length of the fore-court of women, as lying outside the temple house ; hence it follows that, according to his statement too, the eastern gate of the fore-court of laymen was of brass, just as the Mishna informs us. The brass gate is once more mentioned by Josephus in *Bellum*, V, 5, 3: all the gates were of the same size—*ἡ δὲ ὑπὲρ τὴν Κορινθίαν ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικωνίτιδος ἐξ ἀνατολῆς ἀνοιγμένη τῆς τοῦ ναοῦ πύλης ἀντικρὺ πολὺ μείζων*—only one was much bigger than all others. As the position of the gate which is here described is not fully defined and clear, and as the text is not easily understood, we will endeavour to find out from other statements of Josephus which was the largest gate. We shall not find it too difficult, for he gives the measure of this gate as being fifty yards high and forty yards wide, and adds that it had a much richer decoration and a most massive elaboration of silver and gold. He cannot mean the gate of the temple house which led into the holy of holies, for this was but a curtain, nor the one which led from the vestibule into the temple house, for this was fifty-five yards high and thirty-two yards wide¹, nor that of the vestibule, which had no doors at all and stood open. Thus he refers to none of the temple house proper. This is also evident from the description of Josephus, which expressly states that the gate was situated opposite that of the temple house. According to this last sentence the eastern gate of the fore-court of laymen can only be meant, for it was the next gate from west to east after that of the vestibule. Josephus describing it as being richly decorated with gold is in direct opposition, which does not admit of a compromise, to the Mishna, which describes the eastern gate of the fore-court of laymen as being covered with brass, for he places the brass gate in the east of the fore-court of women. If this is the correct explanation we shall have to look upon *ὁ νέως* in the passage, which we have dealt with before and which seemed to agree with the

¹ See *Contra Apionem*, ii. 9.

Mishna, as the designation of the entire inner fore-court enclosed by the surrounding wall¹. And this is certainly very remarkable. Meanwhile, however, there is no special reason why we should adopt the one or the other statement about the brass gate. Let us therefore examine the further accounts of Josephus about this gate.

In *Bellum*, VI, 5, 3, it is said of the brass gate: ἡ δὲ ἀνατολικὴ πύλη τοῦ ἐνδοτέρου χαλκῇ μὲν οὔσα, and in II, 17, 3, πρὸ τῆς χαλκῆς πύλης, ἥτις ἦν τοῦ ἔνδον ἱεροῦ τετραμμένη πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἡλίου. We learn from this that it was situated on the eastern side of the space designated as the inner sanctuary. To give a satisfactory answer to the question with which we are dealing, we have therefore to explain the meaning of τὸ ἔνδον ἱρόν. Spiess² has collected all the passages in which this expression occurs in Josephus; hence we can easily ascertain what is meant by it. From *Bellum*, IV, 3, 12: "Consternation seized the Zealots, when they had lost the first surrounding wall; they fled εἰς τὸ ἐνδοτέρω and hastily closed the gates." It is clear, both from the juxtaposition of the two parts of the temple mount as well as from the gates being mentioned, that the space enclosed by the second surrounding wall was designated as the inner sanctuary. This becomes more evident still from *Bellum*, V, 1, 2: "The Zealots occupied τὸν ἐνδοτέρων τοῦ νεῶ περιβολόν and fixed their arms upon the holy gates facing the sanctuary." Here the wall is expressly called the inner one, and along with it the gates are mentioned just as in the former passage we have quoted. This is further confirmed by the account (*Bellum*, VI, 4, 4) of the victory which the Romans won on the temple mount against the Jews. It states: "About the fifth hour of the day they were overpowered and εἰς τὸ ἔνδον ἱρόν shut in." Hence it is clear that this was a space surrounded by walls. And further, *Bellum*, VI, 1, 8: "Julianus pursued

¹ See Spiess, *Das Jerusalem des Josephus*, p. 71, note 1; comp. *Bellum*, V, 1, 2, and VI, 5, 3.

² *Das Jerusalem des Josephus*, p. 71.

the already victorious Jews μέχρι τοῦ ἐνδοτέρω ἱεροῦ γωνίας," and VI, 2, 7: "The Romans having approached the first wall, the legions began to build mounds, τὸ μὲν ἀντικρὺς τῆς τοῦ εἰσω ἱεροῦ γωνίας," where corners of the inner sanctuary are spoken of, show that Josephus refers to the second wall around the temple. In *Bellum*, V, 3, 1, the whole extent of this space is fully explained and elucidated by details, which are of interest to our question. For here is narrated how the Zealot Eleazar, the same who in the passage which we have quoted above from *Bellum*, IV, 3, 12, took possession of the inner sanctuary, opens the temple gates on the fourteenth of Nissan to admit the people to the passover sacrifices, how John allows his adherents to steal in with arms hidden under their clothes, how these crush the people around the altar and the temple house by treading on them, and in this way conquer τὸ ἐνδότερον ἱερόν. From this description it cannot be doubted that by the inner sanctuary is to be understood the space within the second surrounding wall, whose gates are mentioned here just as above. And finally may be quoted the description in *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 5 (§ 417): "This was the condition of the first encompassment. Not far from it was, in the middle, the second one; a few steps led up to it. It was surrounded by a wall of stone on which was inscribed that the stranger was forbidden under capital punishment to enter. Ὁ μὲν ἐντὸς περιβολὸς had on the south and north side three gates each, on the east side one, the large one." And this passage unmistakably proves, that that wall in which there were seven gates, was called by Josephus the "inner sanctuary" or the "inner surrounding wall." But we learn from this description something more which is of very great importance, viz. that the large gate was the eastern boundary of this sanctuary. The same is evident from *Bellum*, II, 4, 4, where it is stated that the Jews made through the eastern gate a sortie against the Roman guards of the outer sanctuary. It is clear from the whole context that the gate of the

surrounding wall which served as a fortification is meant thereby, especially as it is expressly stated at the end of the sentence that the Jews are repulsed again into the inner sanctuary. This is also evident from *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 7: "A secret subterranean way was made for the king, which led from the Antonia μέχρι τοῦ ἔσωθεν ἱεροῦ πρὸς τὴν ἀνατολικὴν θύραν; he built a tower upon it in which he could go up and protect himself against the revolt of the people."

Let us consider for a moment the last sentence. The subterranean passage was used by the king in order to reach the Antonia, which protected him against the people, who are supposed to take up a menacing attitude before the eastern gate of the inner sanctuary. Hence it would follow that the public meetings, in which an insurrection might occur, took place before this gate. And, indeed, Josephus states in *Bellum*, II, 17, 3, that when the revolution broke out those of rank called a public meeting πρὸ τῆς χαλκῆς πύλης, ἥτις ἦν τοῦ ἔνδον ἱεροῦ τετραμμένη πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἡλίου. Here we have it expressly stated that the large public meeting took place before the eastern gate of the inner sanctuary¹, and the same fact is just as clearly given in another source which has hitherto received little attention². In Ezra x. 9, the free space of the temple רחוב בית האלהים is designated as the meeting-place of the people; the apocryphal third book of Ezra v. 46, which reproduces Ezra iii. 1 in this verse: "The people assembled like one man in Jerusalem," makes, however, the following statement: εἰς τὸ εὐρύχωρον τοῦ πρώτου πυλῶνος τοῦ πρὸς τῇ ἀνατολῇ; and likewise we find 3 Ezra ix. 38, 41, in the place of what is given in Neh. viii. 1: "The people assembled

¹ The same meeting-place is called in *Bellum*, II, 20, 3, only τὸ ἱερόν, which means the temple mount.

² Bertheau, on Ezra iii. 1, refers to it, and is of the opinion that there had been in the Hebrew text the same words as are given in Neh. viii. 1; he adds that the author of 3 Ezra must have known the locality. See *Antiquit.*, XI, 5, 5, § 154.

like one man on the place before the water gate," the following: ἐπὶ τὸ εὐρύχωρον τοῦ πρὸς ἀνατολῆς τοῦ ἱεροῦ πολῶνος. To these entirely different sources, which agree so remarkably, has to be added the statement in 2 Chron. xxix. 4: "The king Hezekiah gathered together the priests and the Levites *המזרח הרחוק* וינספחם," where the meeting-place is expressly given. And they all convincingly prove that the popular meetings were held before the eastern gate of the surrounding wall of the temple. But in the last-named passage Josephus calls it not only the eastern gate of the inner sanctuary, but also the brass gate; hence it follows directly that the eastern gate of the fore-court of laymen was of brass. It is further evident from *Bellum*, II, 5, 3 (§ 293): "ἡ δὲ ἀνατολικὴ πύλη τοῦ ἐνδοτέρῳ ναοῦ χαλκῇ μὲν οὔσα," that it was not, perchance, a mistake which he made, for here these two qualities are also named next to each other¹. This as well as all the passages which we have examined confirms the conclusion which we drew from the Mishna. One statement, however, in *Bellum*, V, 5, 3, which is certainly definite, viz. "ἡ δὲ ὑπὲρ τὴν Κορινθίαν ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικωνίτιδος ἐξ ἀνατολῆς ἀνοιγμένη τῆς τοῦ ναοῦ πύλης ἀντικρὺ πολὺν μείζων," decidedly contradicts this result. For the dimensions which are then given, as well as the position of the gate which is here stated, do not admit of a doubt that the eastern gate of the inner sanctuary is here spoken of, and this Josephus describes as being richly decorated with gold. Is it possible that Josephus should have here mistaken the eastern gate of the fore-court of laymen for that of the fore-court of women, when all other accounts speak of the eastern gate of the surrounding wall as the brass gate?

Let us briefly sum up the results of our inquiry. In the east of the inner fore-court, viz. outside its surrounding wall was the fore-court of women, a space enclosed by its own wall; in the north, east, and south a gate led into it,

¹ See *Contra Apionem*, ii. 9, and Grätz in *Monatsschrift*, 1876, p. 437, note 1.

whilst it was bounded in the west by the wall of the inner fore-court to the eastern gate, to which fifteen steps led up. There were in the four corners of the fore-court of women four places set apart; two of them were used by the Nazirites after having fulfilled their vow, and such as brought their offerings after having been purified from leprosy, issue of blood, and childbed, as the places in which they sojourned, for it was an exception that they had to attend the sacrificial service in the eastern gate of the inner fore-court. On festivals the fore-court was the place in which women worshipped, especially on the feast of tabernacles, when they here watched the large procession and the popular amusements. But this place is not known in any of the accounts about the temple of King Solomon, and not in any of those about the temple of Zerubbabel and Herod. Josephus and the Mishna are the first to mention it, for both deal with the last years preceding the destruction of the temple. Neither was the fore-court required, for older sources from the time after the exile know nothing of women having visited the temple, and even Nazirites were but rare. Several symptoms indicate that the necessity of establishing places for women and Nazirites within the sanctuary did not arise till within the last three decades before the fall of Jerusalem, and about that time the fore-court and its side chambers may have come into existence. This coincides with the feeling of relief which after the death of Caligula filled the Jews of Palestine and Egypt who had been oppressed and treated ignominiously by him, and which manifested itself in grand presents dedicated to the temple in Jerusalem. Alexander the Alabarch had all the gates of the wall of the fore-court, which had only been decorated simply by Herod, covered with gold; Nicanor presented a gate of Corinthian brass; the Queen Helena and Monobaz of Adiabene sacrificial vessels of gold. The brass gate was erected in the east of the inner fore-court, where there was now because of the numerous sacrifices much bustle and activity. In inquir-

ing into the condition of the Jews to which the fore-court of women owes its origin, and in considering the relation in which it stood to the fore-court proper, we got also an insight into the inner life of Judaea and the nature of the sacrifices ; but both of them require further elucidation.

ADOLF BÜCHLER.

VIENNA, *March* 25, 1897.

POSTSCRIPT.

For the question when women visited the temple in large numbers, the letter of Gamaliel I to the Diaspora (circa 40-60), interesting from other points of view, must be taken into consideration (*Sanhedrin*, 11 b ; *j. Sanhedrin*, I, 18 d ; *Tos. Sanhedrin*, II, 6). The account of the Babylonian Talmud (which only differs in unimportant details from the other two accounts) is as follows : לאחנא בני גלוותא דבבל ולאחנא בני גלותא דמדי ולשאר כל גלוותא דישראל שלומכון יסגא לעלם. מהודעין אנחנא לכון דגחליא רביכון ואמריא עדקין וזמנא דאביבא לא ממא ושפרא מלחא באנפיי ובאנפי חבריי ואוסיפנא על שתא דא יומין תלחין. "To our brethren of the Diaspora in Babel, and to our brethren of the Diaspora in Media, and to the rest of the Diaspora of Israel ; May your welfare be ever great ! We inform you that the doves are still tender, the lambs still young, and the time of the ripening of the corn (ears) has not yet come ; it is therefore right in my view and in the view of my colleagues to add thirty days to this year." This letter was dispatched in the month of Adar, shortly before the Passover, and the grounds for intercalating a month are derived from that festival. For every family (*Exod.* xii. 3) a lamb or a kid of the goats was slain on the 14th of Nissan. If the season was not yet sufficiently advanced for the ewes to give birth to their

young in time for the Passover, a month had to be intercalated. On Nissan 16 the first offering of the new grain was appointed (Lev. xxiii. 11); and an intercalated month was rendered necessary should the requisite corn not be ripe.

But there is no obvious connexion between the Passover and the immaturity of the *doves*, for none of the offerings prescribed for this festival consisted of doves. On the other hand, doves were required as offerings necessitated for both men and women who had to undergo Levitical purification. Rashi already points out that Gamaliel referred to the offerings of women after confinement, and to others who required ritual purification, who (according to Lev. xii. 6, and xv. 29) had to bring offerings of birds at the time of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. This usage had grown so intimately connected with the Passover that Gamaliel assigns it as one of the causes for declaring a leap year. This fact is a notable support of the view put forward above, that (*a*) women were scrupulous in bringing these offerings, (*b*) they went in great number to Jerusalem at the Passover, and (*c*) these two facts are to be assumed in the last decades of the existence of the temple (44-70)¹.

¹ A Baraitha in *Sanhedrin*, 11 a (Tos. *Sanhedrin*, II, 4; *j. Sanhedrin*, I, 18d), informs us that the intercalatory month was not inserted because of the kids of the goats, the lambs, or the doves. This assertion must be later than the destruction of the temple in the year 70, when the regard for the sacrifices no longer had actuality. It is at all events older than R. Simon b. Gamaliel (136-170), for he explains the Baraitha by a citation from the Bible.

VIENNA, Jan. 28, 1898.